



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
[www.uspto.gov](http://www.uspto.gov)

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/581,222	06/01/2006	Bart Gerard Bernard Barenbrug	NL03 1424 US1	1685
65913	7590	08/25/2008	EXAMINER	
NXP, B.V.			MEROUAN, ABDERRAHIM	
NXP INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY DEPARTMENT				
M/S41-SJ			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
1109 MCKAY DRIVE				2628
SAN JOSE, CA 95131				
NOTIFICATION DATE		DELIVERY MODE		
08/25/2008		ELECTRONIC		

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

ip.department.us@nxp.com

<b>Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief</b>	<b>Application No.</b>	<b>Applicant(s)</b>
	10/581,222	BARENBRUG ET AL.
	<b>Examiner</b>	<b>Art Unit</b>
	ABDERRAHIM MEROUAN	2628

--The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

THE REPLY FILED 23 July 2008 FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE.

1.  The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on the same day as filing a Notice of Appeal. To avoid abandonment of this application, applicant must timely file one of the following replies: (1) an amendment, affidavit, or other evidence, which places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Appeal (with appeal fee) in compliance with 37 CFR 41.31; or (3) a Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114. The reply must be filed within one of the following time periods:

- a)  The period for reply expires \_\_\_\_\_ months from the mailing date of the final rejection.
- b)  The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth in the final rejection, whichever is later. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of the final rejection.  
Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f).

Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.136(a) and the appropriate extension fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension and the corresponding amount of the fee. The appropriate extension fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened statutory period for reply originally set in the final Office action; or (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of the final rejection, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

#### NOTICE OF APPEAL

2.  The Notice of Appeal was filed on \_\_\_\_\_. A brief in compliance with 37 CFR 41.37 must be filed within two months of the date of filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any extension thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to avoid dismissal of the appeal. Since a Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed within the time period set forth in 37 CFR 41.37(a).

#### AMENDMENTS

3.  The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will not be entered because
- (a)  They raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search (see NOTE below);
  - (b)  They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below);
  - (c)  They are not deemed to place the application in better form for appeal by materially reducing or simplifying the issues for appeal; and/or
  - (d)  They present additional claims without canceling a corresponding number of finally rejected claims.

NOTE: \_\_\_\_\_. (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)).

4.  The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121. See attached Notice of Non-Compliant Amendment (PTOL-324).
5.  Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s): \_\_\_\_\_.
6.  Newly proposed or amended claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ would be allowable if submitted in a separate, timely filed amendment canceling the non-allowable claim(s).
7.  For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a)  will not be entered, or b)  will be entered and an explanation of how the new or amended claims would be rejected is provided below or appended.

The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:

Claim(s) allowed: \_\_\_\_\_.

Claim(s) objected to: \_\_\_\_\_.

Claim(s) rejected: \_\_\_\_\_.

Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: \_\_\_\_\_.

#### AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE

8.  The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, but before or on the date of filing a Notice of Appeal will not be entered because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and sufficient reasons why the affidavit or other evidence is necessary and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e).
9.  The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing a Notice of Appeal, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will not be entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to overcome all rejections under appeal and/or appellant fails to provide a showing of good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 41.33(d)(1).
10.  The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation of the status of the claims after entry is below or attached.

#### REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER

11.  The request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because:  
See Continuation Sheet.
12.  Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s). (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s). \_\_\_\_\_
13.  Other: \_\_\_\_\_.

/XIAO M. WU/  
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2628

Continuation of 11. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: 1. In response to applicant's argument for claim 1, that the prior art doesn't teach:" for all N different views of said 3D images, according to one of the N different views". This argument is not persuasive because Wood in view of Dietrich stated that" A suitable stereoscopic application for the present invention is shown in FIG. 4, where a four-view screen 70 is provided: the screen is an LCD device 72 with an overlying lenticular screen 74 with the arrangement of pixels driven from four different sources 76-79 relative to the individual lenticular arrays being such that, at viewing locations V1 to V4, the images from respective ones of the four sources 76-79 can be seen. A four view display of this type is described in a paper entitled "Multiview 3D-LCD" by Cees van Berkel et al, presented at IS&T/SPIE International Conference on Electronic Imaging, San Jose, 27/1-2/2 1996.(24) It is expected that the main viewer of such a multiple view display will be positioned in the center of the display as shown, typically being involved in some interactive role, and as such will only see a stereoscopic image provided by the two central views. Other viewers, typically in some passive role, may be positioned off center. To provide an optimum combination of quality and cost, the image sources 77, 78 for the two center views V2, V3 are respective 3-D graphics renderers as in FIG. 1." (See, Wood, Column 7, lines 43 to 62). Also the prior art doesn't teach: 'N screen space resamplers each for resampling the shaded color sample, determined by said shader unit means according to one of the N different views.", this argument is not persuasive because Dietrich stated that" With continuing reference to FIG. 1A-1, after multi-sampling, the individual samples are sent to a raster-processor (ROP) 155 as if they were regular fragments. The raster-processor 155 performs various operations on the fragments, including z/stencil testing and color or alpha blending. This may require the raster-processor 155 to read a frame buffer memory 156 in order to retrieve the destination Z or the destination color. To this end, the final pixel color and Z are written back to the frame buffer memory 156."(See, Dietrich, Page 4, Paragraph [0050], lines 1 to 6). Also included is a shader 153 that computes the final fragment, e.g. by applying texture maps or shader programs to the fragment. Such shader programs may be generated in various ways. (Dietrich, Page 4, Paragraph [0049], line 1), 3 -D models are made up of geometric points within a coordinate system consisting of an x, y and z axis; these axes correspond to width, height, and depth respectively (Dietrich, Page 1, Paragraph [0003], lines 3 and 4). The combination of Dietrich and wood is obvious to one in the skilled art at the time of the invention. This combination would provide a stereoscopic image view (see Wood, line 44).

2. In response to applicant's argument for claim 3, that the prior art doesn't teach:" disclose that a grid is chosen if all three requirements are satisfied". Even the prior art doesn't explicitly disclose "if all three requirements are satisfied", these requirements are the basics of grid to be chosen.

3. In response to applicant's argument for claim 4, the argument used for claim 3 above applies to claim 4.

4. In response to applicant's argument for claim 3, that:" Hayhurst does not mention any Z-stacks for additional viewpoints." This argument is not persuasive because Dietrich in view of Hayhurst stated that" the new Z-values are stored in the Z-stack," (see, Hayhurst, Paragraph [0045], line 1).